

motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 561) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 561

Whereas Huntington's Disease is a progressive degenerative neurological disease that causes total physical and mental deterioration throughout a 15- to 20-year period;

Whereas each child of a parent with Huntington's Disease has a 50-percent chance of inheriting the Huntington's Disease gene;

Whereas the onset of Huntington's Disease typically begins in mid-life, between the ages of 30 and 45, though onset may occur as early as the age of 2;

Whereas children who develop the juvenile form of Huntington's Disease rarely live to adulthood;

Whereas, after the onset of Huntington's Disease, the average lifespan of an individual with Huntington's Disease is 15 to 20 years, and the younger the age of onset, the more rapid the progression of the disease;

Whereas Huntington's Disease affects approximately 30,000 individuals and 200,000 genetically "at risk" individuals in the United States;

Whereas, since the discovery of the gene that causes Huntington's Disease in 1993, the pace of Huntington's Disease research has accelerated;

Whereas, although no effective treatment or cure for Huntington's Disease exists as of the date of this resolution, scientists and researchers are hopeful that breakthroughs will be forthcoming;

Whereas researchers across the United States are conducting important research projects involving Huntington's Disease; and

Whereas the Senate is an institution that can raise awareness in the general public and the medical community of Huntington's Disease: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) designates June 25, 2010, as "National Huntington's Disease Awareness Day"; and

(2) recognizes that all people of the United States should become more informed about and aware of Huntington's Disease.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, JUNE 22, 2010

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Tuesday, June 22; that following the prayer and the pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and that following any leader remarks, the Senate proceed to a period of morning business until 12:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the majority controlling the first 30 minutes and Republicans controlling the next 30 minutes, and the majority controlling the final 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the Senate recess from 12:30 until 2:15 tomorrow to allow for the weekly caucus luncheons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order following the remarks of the senior Senator from Oklahoma, Senator INHOFE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE ISSUES

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I came here to talk about a couple of issues on the Armed Services Committee that we are going to be facing.

I only say to my good friend from Ohio that, yes, it is true that 9/11 occurred, and that we have al-Qaida out there, and there are the Taliban and other terrorists who want to kill everyone in this room and all throughout America, and that we were not in a position, financially, to go and defend our country after 9/11.

I suggest that, after Pearl Harbor, the same situation took place. We didn't have time or the luxury of saying do we have the resources to go into this. But it was necessary and it did happen.

Unfortunately, back in the 1990s, during the Clinton administration, the amount of money funding our military reduced by about 40 percent—not just the money but resources too. It went down in terms of force structure, modernization, and operations and personnel, about 40 percent. There was kind of a euphoric attitude at that time, and people were saying that the Cold War was over and we no longer needed the military. I remember it so well. Then, of course, with the downgrading of the military and the peace dividend—we all remember the peace dividend—we would take the money that was going to go to the military and declare a peace dividend.

Unfortunately, peace is not there, and 9/11 happened. This President and this Congress inherited a war, an attack on America, the most vicious attack we have had on our homeland in the continental United States. We had to fight with a reduced army. We had to rebuild the army at the same time.

If I had known the statement was going to be made by my good friend from Ohio, I would have brought my charts to show clearly what happened to the military during the 1990s.

Yes, we do have that problem. It is an expensive war. It is an enduring war.

We have all been over there. We know we are going to win. Things look very good right now in Iraq. It is going to be a little more difficult. It is necessary to do because if we had not done it, we would have had the Taliban and al-Qaida—all of these groups—running rampant over there.

The big difference now in terms of how it affects the United States of America is that back in the days before they had the nuclear weapons and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, a terrorist could have a case bomb, something such as that. Now we are talking about weapons of mass destruction. We are talking about Iran which, according to our intelligence estimates, as early as 2015 could have an ICBM capable of hitting the United States of America on the east coast. That is why it is so much more difficult.

Also, my good friend from Ohio talks about the Republicans. It was not the Republicans who did the \$787 billion stimulus program that did not stimulate. Those were the Democrats. That is not why I am here.

NEW START TREATY

Mr. President, I noticed on this week's agenda—and I am reading now; I think this is right—we are going to have three more hearings in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the New START treaty. That means we will have had, when that is over, 16 Senate Foreign Relations witnesses, over 7 hearings, all of them supporting the New START treaty.

I am reminded of what happened back when we were considering another treaty, the Law of the Sea Treaty. That passed the Senate Foreign Relations Committee 16 to 0, as I recall. When it came to the floor, I recognized—and, frankly, not many others did—that this was a very serious issue. This is the treaty against which Ronald Reagan fought so hard. It was coming up. That was a Republican administration. That was the first President Bush. They were going to run this thing through.

We held hearings. At that time, the Republicans were in the majority. I made sure we had hearings in both of my committees—the Environment and Public Works Committee, as well as the Senate Armed Services Committee.

I see the same thing happening. I gave a lengthy talk last week—I am not going to repeat it now—about why we should oppose the New START treaty. We all remember START I. We all remember START II. Keep in mind, the treaty we are talking about is a treaty not with the countries where we are anticipating problems. It is between Russia and the United States and it has to do with weapons of mass destruction, with nuclear warheads, reducing them in conjunction with reductions that would be imposed upon Russia and, at the same time, delivery systems. We have three ways of delivering them. One is, of course, ICBMs, one is SLCMs, submarine-launched missiles,